

Date: Tue, 6 Sep 94 04:30:09 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #425  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 6 Sep 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 425

Today's Topics:

                    CW future  
            Forwarded QSO from somewhere  
            Fuck all CBers!!  
    Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 6 Sep 1994 05:44:47 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!  
newsfeed.ksu.ksu.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!news.mid.net!crcnis1.unl.edu!unlinfo.unl.edu!  
gbrown@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: CW future  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:  
: Marijan.Miletic@ijs.si (Marijan Miletic) writes:

: [deleted to save bandwidth, but well said]  
: >I am well aware that this technology is years ahead from good old Morse code  
: >in the area of DATA TRANSFER but try 2400b on HF or EME! But Spectrum is NOT  
: >limitless so narrow modes should be preserved for heating ionosphere!  
: >  
: >As we are the last generation of CW experts, it is our duty to preserve over  
: >100 years of history for future generations. I'll try to complete that task.  
  
: Nothing wrong with that attitude. But what purpose of the ARS as expressed

: in 97.1 does pass/fail high speed manual morse mode specific testing  
: fullfill? Remember, preserving the history of radio is not a purpose. In  
: fact there is a test question to that effect.

: Were I, and I feel some others, disagree is that the amateur tests require  
: passing an element that is expressly designed to preserve the history of  
: radio does nothing to fullfill the purposes of the ARS as express by the  
: FCC in Part 97.1 (inclusive).

More stuff about 97.1 deleted...

: 73,

: Dan N8PKV  
: --

Sigs deleted cuz I'm tired of reading them...

Dan, did you notice that Mario is in Slovenia??? Did you ever  
consider that he doesn't give a flying fig about what FCC Part 97.1  
says? Or do you think the world of amateur radio revolves around us  
(or more precisly, you?).

One simple reason we (American) hams should know CW is that it is a  
very popular and \_accessible\_ mode for foreign hams who may not have  
the financial resorces nor even access to more "advanced" modes.  
HF frequencies are "world-wide" frequencies...we share them with hams  
around the world. And \_international goodwill\_ IS a purpose listed in  
97.1.

The "ugly-American" reputation is something we earn everyday. It  
already extends to amateur radio. Why reinforce it by making HF even  
more of an exclusive American playground? Forget 97.1. When you are  
doing your silly polls about how (un)popular CW is or how obsolete it  
is, don't forget to include the rest of the ham world. If furthering  
international goodwill was the ONLY argument for keeping the CW test  
requirement, it would be enough.

And next time, think twice before demanding that a Slovenian justify  
his feelings about CW by citing FCC Part 97.1.

Greg WB0RTK gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu

-----

Date: Tue, 6 Sep 1994 08:16:21 UTC  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!EU.net!news.eunet.fi!  
anon.penet.fi@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Forwarded QSO from somewhere  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Question: is this a regular ham QSO?

\*\*\*\*\*

-----

Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
Subject: Fuck all CBers!!  
John Tiwari <altoids@delphi.com> writes:

>Why do you like CB anyway? because you are all fu..... morons??

\*\*\*\*\*

altoids@delphi.com (John Tiwari) writes:

>I am an amateur radio operator, but i am not in the callbook

\*\*\*\*\*

From: John Tiwari <altoids@delphi.com>

>cb cb cb  
>sucks fu..... di..!

>cb is for a bunch of fu....., shi..., beer guzzling rednecks!  
>cb is for a bunch of morons, who don't know shi. about radio  
>ham is the true amateur service, not cb!

>bunch of fuckin' bitches..

>i am one angry nigga

\*\*\*\*\*

Just asking...

-----

To find out more about the anon service, send mail to help@anon.penet.fi.  
Due to the double-blind, any mail replies to this message will be anonymized,  
and an anonymous id will be allocated automatically. You have been warned.  
Please report any problems, inappropriate use etc. to admin@anon.penet.fi.

-----

Date: 6 Sep 1994 06:44:05 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!fallout!  
cmoore@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jay Maynard (jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu) wrote:

: WAKE UP, PEOPLE! JUST BECAUSE SOMEONE'S NOT A GRADUATE EE DOESN'T MEAN HE  
: DOESN'T BELONG IN HAM RADIO!!!

Simmer down, Jay. I'm not advocating that entry level requirements be changed. I'm trying to figure out a rational way for people with 30 years experience designing commercial radios to get into HF amateur radio without having to learn 13wpm Morse code. Guys like that certainly would "smarten-up" amateur radio (vs dumbing-down).

So far the pro-code-testers have not objected to my 5wpm+extra class written test proposal for obtaining general-class HF phone privileges.

73, KG7BK, 00TC, Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com (Not speaking for Intel)

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #425  
\*\*\*\*\*